31B

```
1
                                   BEFORE THE
                       POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
2
                             STATE OF WASHINGTON
3
   IN THE MATTER OF
   MERCER RANCHES, INC.,
4
                                              PCHB No. 78-198
                Appellant,
5
                                                       78-207
6
                                              FINDINGS OF FACT,
           v.
                                              CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
7
                                              AND ORDER
   STATE OF WASHINGTON,
   DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY,
8
                Respondent.
9
10
         This matter, the appeal of a permit to appropriate public
11
   groundwater, came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Dave J.
12
   Mooney, Chairman, Chris Smith, and David Akana (Presiding) at a formal
   hearing in Pasco on June 6, 1979.
13
        Appellant was represented by its attorney, Dwight A. Halstead;
14
   respondent was represented by Laura E. Eckert, Assistant Attorney
15
```

Having heard the testimony, having examined the exhibits, and having

18 considered the contentions of the parties, the Board makes these:

General.

16

17

יד	TN	t۲	てつべ	$\sim$	$\alpha r$	יים איכורי	ı
г	TL	L	T. L.	GS	OF	FACT	

Ι

Appellant is a family-owned corporation engaged in Sarring in the Horse Heaven Hills. On August 3, 1972 appellant applied for appropria of groundwater (Application No. G3-20394) for the irrigation of 500 ac in Klickitat County. On January 30, 1973 respondent advised appellant that no action would be taken on the application because a "hold" was placed on further appropriation of water in the location requested. T "hold" applied to irrigation rather than domestic or stockwatering use

On May 31, 1977, respondent began processing permit applications after it ascertained that more water than earlier thought was available

ΙI

In November of 1977, Initiative 59 (The Family Farm Water Act, ch. 90.66 RCW) passed and became effective on December 8, 1977.

III

On August 15, 1978, respondent issued a Report of Examination/
Order on appellant's application, recommending approval of the issuance
of a permit including the following "Family Farm" provision:

. . .

That portion of this authorization relating to irrigation is classified as a Family Farm Permit in accordance with Initiative Measure No. 59. This means the land being irrigated under this authorization shall comply with the following definition: Family Farm — a geographic area including not more than two thousand acres of irrigated agricultural lands, whether contiguous or roncontiguous, the controlling interest in which is held by a person having a controlling interest in no more than two thousand

3:

26,

FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

Ę acres of irrigated agricultural lands in the State of Washington which are irrigated under water rights acquired after December 8, 1977. Furthermore, the land being irrigat 2 under this authorization must continue to conform to the defirition of a family farm. 3 The provision allows the use of water by appellant in perpetuity, prov 4 the 500 acres authorized for irrigation remain in "family farm" status 5 (See RCW 90.66.040(1)). Mercer Ranches appealed, contending that its 6 pre-December 1977 application date requires that a permit should be 7 issued without the "family farm" provision. 8 9 Any Conclusion of Law which should be deemed a Finding of Fact 10 is hereby adopted as such. 11 From these Findings, the Board comes to these 12 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW - 3 1 14 The Family Farm Water Act is an additional requirement to the 15 existing water code and permit issuance requirements. RCW 90.66.030. 16 TI 17 "Existing rights" to withdraw and use public waters are not affe 18 19 by the Act: "Nothing in this chapter shall affect any right to withdraw 20 and use public water if such rights were in effect prior to the effective date of the act, and nothing herein shall 21modify the priority of any such existing right." RCW 90.66.020. 22Permits for the withdrawal of public waters for the purpose of 2; irrigating agricultural lands issued after the effective date of the 15

3

> 1 No 9178 N

FIRDINGS OF F. CT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

Act requires that all permits issued for the withdrawal of public waters for the purpose of irrigating agricultural lands be classified and issued with certain conditions. RCW 90.66.050. "Family farm permits" are limited to the use of water withdrawn for irrigation of agricultural lands on lands qualifying as a "family farm".

RCW 90.66.050(1). A "family farm" is a geographic area of not more than 2,000 acres of irrigated agricultural lands, the controlling interest in which is held by a person having a controlling interest in no more than 2,000 acres of irrigated agricultural lands under rights acquired after the effective date of the Act. RCW 90.66.040(1).

III

Appellant's permit to withdraw and use public water was issued after the effective date of the Act and such right was not existing before the effective date of the Act. Accordingly, the provisions of the Act apply to the permit issued to appellant and respondent's action should be affirmed.

IV

Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby adopted as such.

From these Conclusions the Board enters this

ORDER

The action of the Department of Ecology is affirmed.

-3

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

. . .

	. ~ / /
-	DATED this day of June, 1979.
2	POLEUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
3	And I Wanty
4	DAVE J. MOONEY, Charman
5	
6	CHRIS SMITH, Member
7	
8	Dantllläit
9	DAVID AKANA, Member
10	
11	
12	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
2"	
2:	

FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIO, S OF LAW AND ORDER 5